

REMARKS

This reply is submitted in response to the Office action of February 21, 2007. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 4, 5, 7, and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 14-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claims 6 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. The Examiner indicates that claims 2, 3, and 10-23 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph set forth in the Office Action. The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowability with respect to claims 2, 3, and 10-23.

Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9, and 12-23 have been amended. The Applicant submits that claims 1 and 3-23 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 2, 3, and 10-13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph and in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Furthermore, the Examiner has indicated that claims 14-23 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

In view of the Examiner's comments, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include features previously recited in what is now cancelled claim 2 and to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 3, 14, and 19 have been similarly amended. Independent claims 1, 3, 14, and 19 now reflect the allowable subject matter found by the Examiner as stated in the Office Action. The Applicant submits that claims 1, 3, 10-13, and 14-23 are in condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Examiner asserts that the subject matter of claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 is not described in the specification to suffice the enabling requirements under § 112. In particular, claims 4 and 7 have

been rejected because the Examiner states that the Applicant's specification does not provide support for the recited *compensated grayscale data stored in frame memory*. Claims 4 and 7 have been amended to better clarify that which the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 4 and 7 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "data difference between the current frame first compensated grayscale data and the current frame" is stored in the memory. No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support may be found, e.g., on page 7, line 19 through page 8, line 2 of the Applicant's specification. The Applicant submits that claims 4 and 7 are clearly enabled by the specification. Claim 8 was rejected as depending from rejected claim 7. Claim 8 is also clearly enabled by the specification.

The Examiner also rejected claim 5 for failing to comply with the enabling requirements under § 112. In particular, the Examiner states that the recited feature "compensated grayscale data having the number of bits substantially smaller than the number of bits of the grayscale data" is unclear. The Applicant has amended claim 5 to recite, *inter alia*, "the data difference having a number of bits substantially smaller than a number of bits of the current frame grayscale data." No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support may be found, e.g., on page 9, lines 9-24. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 4, 5 and 7 along with dependent claim 8 fully overcome the rejections under § 112, first paragraph and now stand allowable. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 14-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, where the Examiner has set forth specific terms which have rendered the claims indefinite. As set forth above, Applicant has amended the claims in order to more clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to include features previously recited in what is now cancelled claim 2. Claim 3 has been amended as an independent claim. Independent claims 14 and 19 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions to clearly distinguish among the recited elements therein. No new matter has been entered by these amendments. Support for the amendments to claim 1, e.g., may

be found on page 7, line 7 through page 9, line 8 and in Figures 4 and 5. Support for the amendments to claim 3 may be found, e.g., on page 20, line 3 through page 22, line 5 and in Figures 11 and 12. Claims 14 and 19 have been amended in a similar manner as that of claims 1 and 3, respectively. Similar amendments have been made to claims 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-18 and 20-23. Applicant's amendments are believed to obviate this rejection and, thus, withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6825824 to Lee ("Lee" hereinafter). Claim 1 has been amended to include features previously recited in claim 2. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to reflect the allowable subject matter found by the Examiner. In particular, the Examiner states that Lee, as well as the art as a whole, fails to teach generating first, second and third compensated grayscale data as provided in the Applicant's claims (where, as suggested by the Examiner, the terminology has been amended such that the second compensated grayscale data of previously recited claim 1 now corresponds to the calculated data difference, and the previously recited third compensated grayscale data now corresponds to the current frame second compensated grayscale data. Claim 3 has been amended in a substantially similar manner as that of claim 1. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable over Lee. Claims 4-13 depend from what is believed to be one of allowable claims 1 and 3. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 4-13 are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee. Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1 via claim 4. Claim 11 also depends from claim 1. As set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over Lee. At least for reasons of dependence, the

Applicant submits that claims 6 and 11 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicant's attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

Seung-Woo Lee

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By: /Marisa J. Dubuc/
Marisa J. Dubuc
Registration No. 46,673
Customer No. 23413

Date: May 21, 2007

Address: 55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115